DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 119 309 EA 007 943

AUTHOR Gallo, Vincent A.
TITLE Administrative Bonus Pay.
PUB DATE 23 Feb 76
NOTE 8p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association of School Administrators (108th, Atlantic City, New Jersey, February 20-23, 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS Educational Environment; Elementary Secondary Education; *Merit Pay; Models; *Principals; *Staff Improvement

ABSTRACT

The administrative bonus model described here assumes that educational delivery systems can be improved by improving people. That is, a people-improvement program is a better buy than the adoption and innovation syndrome of the fifties and sixties. This plan restores the principalship to its rightful place in the line of authority, power, and responsibility. Under the plan, the principal assumes responsibilities such as classroom visitation and conference and is paid a percentage bonus for these tasks. The restructured job description for the building administrator encompasses three basic areas: public relations, improvement of instruction, and management services. The implementation of the model would, over time, produce a school organization with a more open climate and encourage collaboration in decision-making. The model would produce concomitant increases in personal respect and commitment among and across disciplines and grade levels. The model is a comprehensive plan suitable for inservice and preservice modes, and could be used in its entirety or in bits and pieces. (Author/IRT)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED119309

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATORS
108th Annual Convention
Atlantic City, N. J. February 20-23, 1976

SPEAKER: Dr. Vincent A. Gallo, Assistant Professor Educational Administration, Chapman College, Orange, California

TOPIC: Administrative Bonus Pay

PLACE: Room 16, Convention Hall

TIME: 9:30 a.m., Monday, February 23

PROGRAM: Page 91

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Summary of Remarks

For those of you who are searching for a quick implementation system to solve your local district's problems, I must confess, I do not have the answer. For those districts which are wrought with political conflict and crises, I don't have a solution. To those here today who represent districts with student populations in excess of 25,000, I share your concern. However, for some here today who wish to become informed on an Administrative Staff Improvement Plan that: (a) took six years to conceive (b) was field tested in two school districts (below 3,000 A.D.A.) and (c) requires considerable thought, concerted action, and a longitudinal plan, please stay.

The spin-off effects of the plan have demonstrated an increase in the trust level among administrators, teachers, patrons, and school board, and seemed to justify in the eyes of these groups, the central purpose for the role of the principal. The system was ranked under Project Renewal as number one-rural in Oregon.

Administrative bonus incentives can be viewed in many ways depending on your frame of reference. The model which will be described in this paper begins with a basic assumption. The assumption is : That we can improve our educational delivery system by improving people. Said in another way, we believe that a people improvement program is a better buy than the adoption and innovation syndrome of the fifties and sixties. Research will support this assumption.

The Administrative Bonus Plan model restores the principalship to his/her rightful place in the line of authority, power, and responsibility. In my opinion, the line has been eroded markedly. Research supports the notion that educational quality, climate, and personnel attitudes of individual schools are highly correlated to the building principal's degree of educational leadership and expertise. The Administrative Bonus model can work in isolation, however, in my opinion, the plan will meet with little success unless we re-direct our line of authority, power, and responsibility beginning with the board of education.

SOCIAL FORCES

Before we discuss the model let us grossly examine the forces that bear upon the climate surrounding our schools today. The knowledge explosion and accompanying abundance of educational materials are two forces. The advent of collective bargaining and conflict concerning school governance are other forces. The superintendent's relinquishment of his involvement in curricular development is another

- MORE - 2

These copies were made on an A.B. Dick 1600 Copy Printer

EA 007 943

force. The advent of federal and state laws that impinge upon the schools is still another force. In the mage of social forces the principal appears to have abdicated his responsibilities to others in the fields of personnel, evaluation, curriculum development, supervision of teachers, professional growth of staff, etc.

In a sense educators are moving the line of authority, power and responsibility away from its vertical alignment, creating political and educational triangles. I contend that many principals have given to others several responsibilities they should have retained. In giving away certain areas of responsibility, or badly administering problem areas, they have created a conflict triangle. Using a term borrowed from the legal profession, educators have introduced the officious intermeddler triangle.

Here are several illustrations of the officious intermeddler triangle syndrome. The shape of this structure is triangular. The triangle of conflict can occur at the building level when a principal withholds information received from direct contact with a concerned parent regarding a particular teacher. The principal becomes the officious intermeddler by not making the teacher aware of the contact and by not redirecting the parent to the teacher.

Other examples of the officious intermeddler triangle occur: (1) when curriculum directors circumvent the principal, (2) when personnel directors assume the leadership in hiring and evaluating, (3) when pupil personnel directors circumvent, and (4) when the principal passes his responsibilities of evaluation, curriculum development, and staff improvement to his assistants. The triangle is viewed by the teaching staff as one of incompetence and the attitudes of trust often are shaken.

What I am suggesting is that the present roles of the superintendent, the support staff, and the principalship be realigned in a line relationship that begins with the board, moves vertically downward to the superintendent, and downward to the building principal. The suggestion includes the restoration of emphasis on instruction and staff improvement by an involved superintendent. Restoration of the principal as the instructional leader in his building will rekindle the climate of confidence among his staff. At the building level is where "the rubber hits the road" and where the "buck passing" should cease. The revised role of the building principal would include; (a) an honest effort to spend 60% of his working day on the teaching-learning process, and (b) the systematic effort to improve people using the modern skills of clinical supervision, inquiry, questioning strategies, planning, etc. All of the kinds of skills which are possessed by central office coordinators or trained college supervisors should become the knapsack of knowledge for each and every building principal in today's educational world. Anything short of such a knowledge and skills base places a principal in a most compromising situation. Let us trace the profile of the principalship, past and present, to illustrate the skills, I believe, he must possess in the educational world of the seventies.

HISTORICAL PROFILE

The role of the principal has undergone progressive stages. Each decade appears to usher in a new role need. During the twenties and thirties the cult of efficiency demanded management and public relations skills. The forties and fifties brought the need for humanistic management skills of discernment of sociological, psychological, and informal needs of organizations. The fifties and sixties became the age of hasty adoption where the need for curriculum and communication skills were

- More -

paramont. Now in the seventies a further dimension is apparent; the need is for involvement and expertise in instruction to restore the trust relationship between administration and staff.

Size has played havoc with trust. Because of size, class, school, district, etc., we have lost the personal touch and educators appear to some as jugglers--juggling schedules--juggling grade structures--juggling roles--juggling the day--juggling the year to accomodate exploding student populations and costs.

In the entire process above, the building principal's role as educational leader has been eroded. In the author's opinion, this erosion has caused many of the negative feelings of distrust within our profession.

Let us examine how teachers feel about their principal. The remarks below illustrate a divergency relating to role perception among teachers and principal. The kinds of "badmouthing" that filters down into the community that subverts trust.

1. "The principal performing his evaluation function is not as competent as I."

2. "I would prefer a lassiez-faire principal so I can do my own thing."

3. "Evaluations are generally non-specific--usually ballooned in scale."

4. "I would prefer a ballooned evaluation so it doesn't affect my ability to transfer or move elsewhere."

5. "I inwardly resent the inflated evaluation--he is a nice guy but so inept when it comes to C & I."

6. "I'm leary of any new system that would jeopardize my job."

7. "If he drops in one more time unannounced, I'm going to shift gears and go into the old question and answer charade I've practiced with my class."

8. "I'll introduce him next time he walks in and get him started talking."

From these comments, we can draw a profile continum that illustrates the role variation of the principal. On one end of our continum would be the scale labeled - non involvement, in the center would be the scale of lassiez-faire, and on the other extreme would be involvement. Many principals in today's educational world are resting between lassiez-faire and involvement. Those that are totally involved are experts in management, public relations, and curriculum and instruction. Principals should be trained as experts, treated as experts, and paid and held accountable as experts.

Let us now dwell on the broad areas of C & I. H ere we come to the heart of the problem. C & I consists of many components. Three of these components are: (1) Interpersonal Relations, (2) Supervisory Systems, and (3) Teaching Strategies. Visualizing these components as circles overlapping each other one can see a small area approximating the shape of a heart common to all three circles. Here, in the heart of the matter, is an area which can be labeled the

- More -

Systematic and Objective Analysis of Instruction. The sole purpose of the heart would be to improve instruction in a personal manner. In my opinion, a people program to assist persons to improve their own skills through a system that produces healthy, mild anxieties, uncovers dissonance, and promotes "striving," while simultaneously affecting self-worth, ego, communication and trust. The reintroduction of a personal dimension of involvement for those authority figures in the school district.

In many instances the principal's role in the systematic improvement of instruction has been slowly absorbed. We find the personnel director selecting new staff, operating as an ombudsman, and serving as chief of the evaluation process. We find the curriculum director chiefly responsible for implementation and staff improvement. Instead these are the areas of responsibility that should be restored to the principalship. The officious intermeddler triangle has been created with the slow erosion of the building principal's scope of responsibility.

PRINCIPAL KEY MAN

After many years of experience as an elementary and secondary teacher and principal, curriculum director and superintendent it became apparent to this writer that our present-day delivery system falls short in two crucial areas. One area involves the principal's role in the total system and the other area involves the principal's role in the total system and the other area involves the manner educators lend the principal support services. In both cases educators appear to be violating data gathered through research in the fields of role perception and educational climate. Furthermore, little attention seems to be paid to the officious intermeddler triangle that slowly bends the line of authority, power, and responsibility that connects the superintendent's office with that of the building principal. I'm not here to blame anyone; we get enough of that from our public. What I'm trying to say is that often forces beyond our control appear and take hold.

Field study and observation completed prior to implementation of the program pointed to a considerable reluctance by the building principal to perform class visitations. Probing this reluctance, it was discovered that many principals fell short in their knowledge base pertaining to the systematic improvement of instruction. Also data indicated that the principal was always too busy with other tasks to perform classroom visitations. Our response to the "busy principal" has been: "If we can show you how, would you be willing to undertake a provisional attempt?"

With empirical data we were able to convince a school board, the administrators, and finally the teachers that a people improvement program was in order and that the principalship needed to be restored to its rightful educational and political function--namely that of providing educational leadership. For a more definitive treatment of this subject I refer you to a monograph written by this author entitled, "Should We Abolish or Retrain the Principalship," Bureau of Research, University of Oregon, 1971. A comprehensive task analysis was made of the building principal and a checklist was developed to assist the superintendent in his appraisal of administrative performance.

Initially each principal conferred with the superintendent to determine gaps in his/her knowledge base. Later a five year plan was approved by board action and the following training sequence was developed.

- More -

1. School organization total commitment
   a. Reorganization of bureaucratic decision making
   b. Curriculum committees and grade level chairman
   c. Release time and establishment of priorities
   d. Funds for membership in civic and service ortanizations
2. Role of the principal within the total commitment
3. Value systems of the community leadership structure
   a. Individual values
   b. Community values
   c. Identification of community leaders to enhance decision-making
4. Assessment of open-closed climate in each school
5. Communication skills—individual and group interaction
6. Research data used as "benchmarks" to support "good" teaching learning
7. Clinical supervision-trust relationships: the basic concept of introducing mild rather than paralysing anxieties with evaluation and appraisal
8. Tools to assist feedback of teaching-learning
   a. Flanders
   b. Task analysis
   c. Inquiry diagnosis
   d. Questioning strategies
   e. Force field system
   f. Joe-Harry window
   g. Your own system
   h. Verbatim
   i. In-class diagnosis
   j. Precision planning for classroom instruction
   k. Choosing alternative lessons or methods

l. Reality therapy and responsibility

m. Flow-charts

n. Video tape self-teach minicourse

o. Behavioral objectives

p. Getzels-Guba Model--social and organizational needs

ADMINISTRATIVE BONUS PAY

In an effort to change the role of the building principal from a purely managerial role to one which includes curricular and instructional improvement, the bonus system was introduced. This concept aimed to place the responsibility and action within a building in the hands of the principal who shares strategic, political, and personal advantages of considerable magnitude. Under the plan, the principal assumed responsibilities such as classroom visitation and conferencing; he was paid a percentage bonus for these tasks. The restructured job descriptions for the building administrators encompass the three basic areas: (1) Public Relations, (2) Improvement of Instruction, and (3) Management Services.

Twice a year the building administrators met with the superintendent to detail job targets. Field tests in clinical supervision gave valuable guidelines. For instance, we were aware of the fact that it took one and one-half hours per day to complete a clinical cycle. Therefore, a realistic figure of 140 cycles per school year was established as a base. Our field testing also indicated that a supervisor could adequately handle fifteen to twenty teachers. Once the plan became operational, we found that the principals were averaging ten hours of face-to-face time with each and every building staff member per year. One principal included in his job target to listen to every child read, a direct result of his visitations. The classroom observation included pre and post conferences which were one criterion for the bonus payment. The building administrators were enthusiastic about their restructured roles, not only did they have a chance to increase their yearly pay, but through the widened areas of involvement, they had a good opportunity to use their skills in communications, supervision, and curricular improvement.

SUMMARY

The plan is longitudinal in character. The model described above attempts to place emphasis on the area of teacher improvement and/or teacher evaluation. The model utilizes the principal as the educational leader. Research supports the generalization that the teacher-learning black box is influenced more by the teacher rather than by the adoption and use of specific programs. If we make the basic assumption--that the teacher, not the program, truly affects learning--then what are we, as educators, doing about it?

Another aspect of some concern deals with teacher militancy, most teachers believe they know more about their area of expertise than the person or persons assigned the task of staff evaluation. Therefore, the function of evaluation is viewed by teachers as intimidating and paternalistic.

The model described above would alter the evaluation system. Headed by

- More -

the principal, the altered system would be dichotomized into evaluation (self-improvement) and appraisal (rating). The system would utilize log sheets to record activity in terms of clinical supervision aimed at the improvement of instruction. To be successful the model requires district resources that will allow for the retraining of key personnel, some reshuffling of resources, and some reemphasis of the roles of curriculum directors. The retraining of key personnel would then result in the retraining of teachers. The cycle, once completed, would then be monitored by log sheets and external evaluation to insure accountability.

In my opinion, the total input of the model proposed would over time produce a school organization with a more open climate of co-equals allowing each persons colloboration in decision-making. The model would produce concomitant increases in personal respect and commitment among and across disciplines and grade levels. The model, drawn from the social sciences, becomes a comprehensive plan suitable for inservice and preservice modes, and could be used in its entirety or in bits and pieces.

#####